Divergent Modes of Perception; how "hallucination" hides our hubris

Benjamin James

December 19, 2025

The word hallucination arrives with unusual authority. It sounds finished, clinical, as though it refers to something isolated, named, and understood. To say that someone is hallucinating feels like saying that a machine has malfunctioned; it is a discrete error occurring inside an otherwise reliable system. However, the moment one pauses over the term, it begins to wobble. What, precisely, is being named? An experience? A perception? A belief? A failure to meet a standard that is rarely examined but always assumed? The apparent solidity of the word conceals its surprising vagueness. It feels concrete, but it collapses under scrutiny, revealing less a thing in the world than a verdict rendered upon certain kinds of experience.

This is not because the experiences themselves are unreal, trivial, or invented. People see, hear, feel, and sense things that are intense, meaningful, and sometimes frightening. Any honest inquiry must begin by taking those experiences seriously. The problem lies not in the phenomena of experience, but in the confidence with which we name them. "Hallucination" does not simply describe what someone reports; it quietly judges how that report relates to an external frame of reference. It tells us, without saying so, that the experience has failed to line up with what is collectively recognized as real. In this sense, the term functions less as a neutral description and more as a marker of misalignment. It signals that something has gone out of bounds, not necessarily in the mind, but in the relationship between an individual's account of reality and the symbolic order that governs shared life.

Once this is noticed, the word begins to look less like a window and more like a gate. To call an experience a hallucination is to close certain questions while opening others. It closes the question of reference, what might this experience be responding to, and replaces it with a simpler one, why is this person mistaken? The term carries with it an unspoken presumption that reality is already settled, that its contours are known, and that deviation from them must therefore be internal, private, and erroneous. What appears as clinical

clarity is often a shortcut, a way of avoiding the more difficult task of examining how reality itself is defined, maintained, and enforced.

My argument does not assert that hallucinations are secretly true perceptions, nor does it suggest that all unusual experiences should be affirmed without question. That would merely invert the same certainty it seeks to unsettle. Instead, it asks a more modest and more unsettling question, whether "hallucination" names a coherent phenomenon at all, or whether it is a cultural narrative we rely on when our frameworks for understanding perception, meaning, and difference begin to strain. My suspicion is not that something mysterious is being hidden behind the term, but that something ordinary and structurally revealing is being overlooked. The word may be doing work for us, administrative, symbolic, and stabilizing work, precisely because it allows us to avoid confronting deeper uncertainties about how perception operates and whose perception counts.

At its core, the intuition guiding this inquiry is simple. We tend to treat hallucination as if it were an object, a thing that can be located inside a mind and examined like a lesion or a glitch, but what if it is better understood as a relationship rather than a substance? What if it marks a point at which experience resists easy translation into a shared language of objects, causes, and categories? In that case, hallucination would not be a failure of perception in isolation, but a failure of coordination between a person and their environment, between private sense-making and public meaning, and between lived reality and symbolic authority. The confidence with which we locate the problem "in the head" may say less about our heads and more about the limits of our system doing the locating.

Following this line of thought requires a certain restraint. It asks us to slow down and resist the urge to explain too quickly. Rather than rushing to replace one definition with another, the task is to examine the conditions under which certain experiences become intelligible or unintelligible, legitimate or suspect. This means attending to perception not as a mirror of the world but as an active process shaped by symbols, habits, and expectations. It means recognizing that variation in perception is not an anomaly but an inevitability, and that what we call normal is already the result of heavy filtering and compression. It also means taking

seriously the fact that some minds, what we have come to call neurodivergent, interact with these filters differently, not as a matter of failure, but of structure.

From there, our inquiry widens. If certain modes of perception consistently fall outside accepted norms, how do institutions respond? How do systems built on predictability, authority, and coordination manage experiences that loosen their grip? The history of modern mental health, particularly in the decades following the cultural shocks of the twentieth century, begins to look less like a march of scientific progress and more like a series of stabilizing reactions to perceived disorder. Diagnostic categories multiply, boundaries harden, and our tolerance for ambiguity narrows. What begins as an effort to help individuals cope with distress gradually takes on a broader function, the maintenance of a symbolic order.

Seen against this backdrop, our contemporary mental health crisis appears in a different light. It is not simply that more people are broken, or that brains are failing at unprecedented rates. It may be that the symbolic environments we inhabit have become too rigid, too literal, and too intolerant of variation to accommodate the full range of human perception. The question, then, is not whether hallucinations are real or unreal, but what our reliance on the concept reveals about our own assumptions. We may be less troubled by strange experiences than by the possibility that our ways of naming reality are narrower than reality itself.

If our first step is to loosen the grip of the word “hallucination,” the second is to refuse the reflex that follows to replace one confident claim with another. This is where inquiry usually falters. Having unsettled a category, we rush to stabilize ourselves by proposing a better one, but there is a more demanding move available, one that requires patience rather than ingenuity. To suspend ontology altogether and ask what, exactly, we are justified in claiming. Not what hallucinations “are,” but what we actually encounter when we say the word. The answer, once stripped of habit and authority, is surprisingly thin.

We never encounter hallucinations directly. What we encounter are reports of experience that are spoken, written, remembered, often hesitantly offered and imperfectly translated into language. These reports are shaped from the outset by the vocabulary available to the

speaker, by cultural expectations about what counts as strange or acceptable, and by prior stories about minds that deviate from the norm. A person describing an experience does not begin from neutral ground; they speak into a field already crowded with assumptions. The very act of reporting alters the experience, compressing it into familiar forms, smoothing its ambiguities, or exaggerating its strangeness in response to perceived scrutiny. What reaches us is never raw perception, but perception already folded into narrative.

On the other side of the exchange stands interpretation, no less shaped by forces that rarely announce themselves. Clinicians, researchers, and institutions do not listen in a vacuum. They are charged with responsibilities that extend beyond understanding. They are managing risk, assigning categories, predicting outcomes, and maintaining social order. An interpretation that leaves too much open, too much ambiguity about what is happening or why, is often not an option. Uncertainty must be resolved into something legible, documentable, and actionable. Under these conditions, the pressure to convert a report into a recognizable object is immense. Hallucination serves this purpose well. It gathers disparate experiences under a single heading and renders them administratively tractable.

When we put these two sides together, shaped self-report and filtered interpretation, it becomes difficult to see where an ontological claim could responsibly enter. There is no independent access to a thing called “a hallucination” that could anchor our theories. There is only a chain of translations from experience into language, language into diagnosis, and diagnosis into institutional response. To speak confidently of hallucinations as entities within the mind is to mistake the end product of this chain for its origin. It is to treat a label as though it were a discovery, rather than a decision.

From this vantage point, our familiar definition of hallucination, as perceiving something that is not there, begins to look less like a description and more like a shortcut. It presupposes a stable inventory of what “is” there, a settled map of reality against which deviation can be measured, but such a map is never simply given. It is maintained through shared symbols, conventions of attention, and agreements about relevance. When an experience fails to line up with this map, the failure may lie not in perception itself, but in the alignment between

personal sense-making and public reference. What breaks down is not sight or hearing, but the smooth translation of experience into a language others recognize.

This reframing shifts the problem decisively. Hallucination no longer appears as an intrinsic malfunction of perception, but as a breakdown in shared symbolic reference. Something is happening, but what it is happening "as" cannot be agreed upon. The experience resists incorporation into the existing symbolic order, and so it is placed into the category of error. This placement feels natural only because our symbolic order presents itself as reality rather than as one way, among many, of carving it up. The label reassures us that the map is intact by locating the disturbance in the traveler rather than in the terrain.

At this point, restraint becomes an ethical as well as an epistemic demand. The temptation to inflate uncertainty into ontology, to declare that because an experience is strange, it must belong to a special class of pathological objects, is strong, but unjustified. The evidence does not compel it. We are not forced to say that hallucinations exist as things in themselves; we choose to say it because doing so simplifies the situation. It allows us to stop asking awkward questions about how reality is negotiated, whose perceptions are authoritative, and how much variation our systems can tolerate. Ontological inflation, in this sense, is not an innocent mistake. It is a convenience.

None of this requires denying that people suffer, sometimes profoundly, in relation to their experiences. Distress is real, impairment is real, and the need for care is real, but suffering does not automatically confer metaphysical clarity. To name uncertainty as pathology is a cultural move before it is a scientific one. It reflects a preference for order over openness, for resolution over inquiry. Once an experience is classified as a hallucination, it no longer demands understanding; it demands management. The shift is subtle but decisive.

By refusing to say what hallucinations really are, we make room for a more careful investigation of how perception, meaning, and difference are structured in the first place. We allow ourselves to notice that what appears as error may be a mismatch, that what seems private may be relational, and that what we rush to locate inside individual minds may, in fact, be distributed across social and symbolic systems. This refusal to claim more

than we know is not a retreat into skepticism for its own sake. It is a clearing of the ground, a way of ensuring that whatever follows is not built on our quiet arrogance of certainty.

Once ontology is suspended, perception itself comes back into view not as a transparent window onto the world, but as a process that has been quietly doing most of the work all along. The idea that we simply receive reality as it is, like light falling onto a camera sensor, is one of our most durable myths of modern thought. It flatters us with the sense that what we see is what is there, and that disagreement must therefore signal error or distortion. Yet nothing in our lived experience supports this picture. Perception is not passive reception but active binding. It is a continuous, adaptive negotiation between an organism and the constraints it must move within to remain viable.

To perceive is to select, to emphasize, and to stabilize. It is to take an unruly stream of sensation and bind it into forms that can be acted upon. This binding does not occur in a vacuum. It is shaped by bodily capacities. The reach of our limbs, the acuity of our senses, and the rhythms of breath and metabolism. A world perceived by a creature with wings is not the same world perceived by one that crawls, even if they occupy the same space. Perception is already scaled, angled, and weighted by the body that enacts it. What counts as salient is inseparable from what the body can do.

Beyond the body, perception is tuned to environmental regularities. We learn, often without noticing, which patterns repeat, which changes matter, and which fluctuations can be safely ignored. The hum of a refrigerator fades into silence; the shifting play of shadows on a wall becomes background; the countless micro-variations in sound and light are smoothed into stable objects. This smoothing is not a flaw. It is a requirement for functioning in a world that would otherwise overwhelm us with detail. Perception compresses reality not because reality is simple, but because life demands tractability.

Social coordination adds another layer to this binding. We do not merely perceive for ourselves; we perceive in ways that can be shared, pointed to, named, and agreed upon. Language, gesture, and convention shape attention long before we are aware of them. We learn what counts as an object, what deserves concern, and what can be dismissed as noise. A child learns not just to see a tree, but to see “a tree.” A stable, nameable thing that

others also recognize. In this way, perception is braided with the symbolic structures that allow groups to coordinate their actions and expectations. What is perceived is already filtered through what can be communicated.

Seen from this angle, “normal” perception reveals itself as an extraordinary achievement of compression. It is highly selective, aggressively economical, and oriented toward usefulness rather than completeness. It gives us a world that is coherent enough to navigate, not a world that is exhaustively represented. Vast amounts of information are excluded at every moment. Gradients are flattened, ambiguities resolved, and possibilities collapsed into singular interpretations. The apparent solidity of the world is the result of this ongoing exclusion. Stability is not discovered; it is produced.

This is the point at which our common assumption that accurate perception means taking in as much of reality as possible quietly dissolves. Perception is not an additive process. It does not improve by accumulating more data. It improves, in functional terms, by discarding what does not matter for the task at hand. To perceive everything would be to perceive nothing in particular. The world would blur into an undifferentiated mass, rich in information but poor in meaning. What we call clarity depends on blindness, and what we call realism depends on omission.

Once this is understood, the notion that there is a single, privileged way of perceiving the world becomes difficult to sustain. If perception is always binding experience to constraint through selective compression, then different bindings will produce different worlds. Not different fantasies layered over the same reality, but different enactments of what that reality affords. The differences may be subtle or profound, but they are structurally inevitable. Variation is not an exception to our perceptual process; it is a consequence of how the process works.

This insight carries an important implication. If perception excludes by design, then divergence in what is noticed, emphasized, or stabilized cannot automatically be treated as malfunction. To notice something others ignore is not, in itself, a sign of error. It may be a difference in what has been filtered out, a shift in what is treated as salient, or a variation in how symbols are bound to experience. The fact that most people agree on a particular

perceptual framing does not make it ontologically complete; it makes it socially dominant. Consensus tells us about coordination, not about exhaustiveness.

Discomfort arises when we forget this and begin to treat the products of perceptual compression as reality itself rather than as one viable rendering among many. When the world we have learned to see is mistaken for the world as it is, deviation from it appears not as difference but as defect. The very mechanisms that allow shared life, stability, agreement, and predictability become criteria for truth. Perception that does not conform is cast as suspect, not because it lacks grounding, but because it does not fit established bindings.

This is why my earlier refusal to posit hallucinations as entities matters so much here. If perception is always selective and symbolic, then the line between "seeing what is there" and "seeing what is not" cannot be drawn without reference to the symbolic and social frameworks that govern attention. What is "there" is not given independently of how we have learned to bind experience. The claim that someone perceives something that is not there often conceals a quieter claim that they perceive something that we do not know how to place.

None of this means that all perceptual differences are benign or that all bindings are equally viable. Some ways of binding experience may indeed generate distress, disorientation, or impaired action, but the source of that difficulty cannot be located simply in the act of perceiving differently. It must be sought in the fit, or misfit, between a given mode of perception and the constraints of the environment in which it operates. A perceptual style that functions well in one context may become overwhelming or disabling in another. Dysfunction, in this light, is relational before it is intrinsic.

By replacing naive realism with a model of perception as symbol–constraint binding, we gain a more generous and more precise vocabulary. We can speak about perception without imagining a perfect baseline from which others deviate. We can recognize that what we call "normal" is not neutral but optimized for certain forms of coordination, at certain scales, under certain historical conditions. We can begin to see how easily difference becomes pathologized when these conditions are treated as universal. The stage is now set to examine

what happens when this inevitable variation in perception encounters systems that are increasingly intolerant of anything they did not themselves design.

Once variation in perception is acknowledged as inevitable rather than exceptional, the question of neurodivergence can no longer be treated as a peripheral concern. It becomes central, not because it names a special class of minds, but because it exposes something general about how perception, symbols, and environments interact. Neurodivergence is often spoken of as a list of diagnoses, autism, ADHD, bipolarity, schizophrenia-spectrum conditions, obsessive compulsive, and dissociative patterns, as though these names captured discrete pathologies with clear boundaries. These labels are, at best, rough attempts to gesture toward recurring patterns in how people relate to attention, meaning, affect, and stability. They do not point to broken perception so much as to different ways perception is coupled to constraint.

To speak structurally, neurodivergence describes variation in how experience is bound into coherent form. The difference is not that neurodivergent individuals perceive a different reality in some mystical or delusional sense, nor that they are simply missing capacities others possess. The difference lies in the dynamics of coupling. How salience is assigned, how ambiguity is tolerated, and how aggressively experience is compressed into symbolic categories. These dynamics shape what stands out, what recedes, and how much interpretive work perception is required to do in order to remain stable.

Salience assignment is one of the most obvious points of divergence. In many neurotypical modes of perception, salience is tightly regulated by social relevance and pragmatic utility. Attention flows toward faces, gestures, threats, and cues that support coordination. Other information is rapidly backgrounded. In neurodivergent perception, this hierarchy can be flatter or differently organized. Details that others discard, such as patterns in sound, texture, rhythm, or internal sensation, may remain vivid. This is not a surplus of perception so much as a difference in what is allowed to fade. The world appears denser, sometimes richer, sometimes overwhelming, not because more has been added, but because less has been subtracted.

Ambiguity tolerance marks another axis of variation. For some, ambiguity is quickly resolved, even at the cost of precision. A vague stimulus is snapped into a familiar category so that action can proceed. For others, ambiguity persists. Competing interpretations are held open longer, or the pressure to resolve them is experienced as distressing rather than relieving. This can produce a heightened sensitivity to contradiction, irony, or subtle shifts in context, but it can also lead to exhaustion when the environment demands rapid closure. Ambiguity is not simply tolerated or rejected; it is metabolized differently.

Symbolic compression rates further differentiate perceptual styles. Compression is the process by which complex, continuous experience is reduced into stable symbols of this object, that person, or this intention. In some neurodivergent patterns, compression is slower, less automatic, or more effortful. Symbols may feel provisional rather than fixed, requiring constant re-evaluation. In others, compression can be rapid but brittle, producing symbols that dominate experience with unusual force once formed. Neither pattern implies error in itself. Each reflects a different strategy for maintaining coherence under constraint.

The consequences of these differences are practical and immediate. Noticing what others filter out can be a source of insight or creativity, but it can also be a source of fatigue. Environments saturated with symbols, bureaucratic language, social scripts, and implicit norms can become oppressive when symbolic processing itself is the primary demand. What is effortless for one perceptual style becomes labor-intensive for another. Over time, this mismatch produces strain, not because the perceptual system is failing, but because it is being asked to operate in conditions for which it was not optimized.

Stress sharpens these dynamics. Under sufficient pressure, the balance between perception and symbol can shift dramatically. For some neurodivergent individuals, symbols begin to intrude rather than recede. Thoughts, images, or interpretations acquire an insistent quality, no longer easily backgrounded or revised. The mind does not lose contact with reality so much as lose flexibility in how reality is symbolized. Meaning becomes loud. Patterns that were once negotiable harden. This is often the point at which the language of hallucination enters the picture.

Here the crucial argument comes into focus. What is labeled hallucination is frequently neurodivergent perception evaluated against neurotypical symbolic norms. A voice, image, or felt presence is not assessed primarily in terms of how it functions for the person experiencing it, but in terms of whether it conforms to an agreed-upon model of perception. The question implicitly asked is not “What is happening here?” but “Does this match how perception is supposed to work?” When the answer is no, the experience is reclassified as error.

This norm comparison does a great deal of work while appearing to do very little. It allows systems to treat variation as deviation without acknowledging the arbitrariness of the baseline. Neurotypical perception, optimized for certain forms of social coordination, is taken as the standard of reality itself. Other modes of binding experience to constraint are measured against it and found wanting. The fact that they may function coherently within different environmental or relational contexts is rarely considered. What matters is alignment with the dominant symbolic order.

The result is a predictable pattern. Neurodivergent individuals are diagnosed at higher rates not simply because they suffer more, but because their modes of perception are more likely to trigger the category boundaries of existing systems. Their experiences are harder to translate into the sanctioned language of normalcy, and so they are more readily medicalized. Chronic distress follows, not always from perception itself, but from the constant effort required to adapt to environments that neither recognize nor accommodate their coupling dynamics. Their lived experience is misrecognized again and again, not out of malice, but out of structural mismatch.

This misrecognition has a particular texture. It often takes the form of being told that one’s experience is not just different, but wrong. Wrongly interpreted, wrongly felt, and wrongly trusted. Over time, this erodes confidence in one’s own perceptions. The person learns to doubt not only what they see or hear, but their capacity to make sense of it at all. The authority to define reality migrates outward, toward experts and institutions, while the individual is left managing the residue of an experience that has been stripped of legitimacy.

It is important to notice how easily this process slides from description into judgment. A perceptual event that does not fit established norms is first described as unusual, then as symptomatic, and finally as pathological. Each step feels reasonable in isolation. Together, they produce a powerful narrative that neurodivergent perception is inherently unreliable, but this conclusion rests on a sleight of hand. It confuses difference in coupling with defect in perception. It treats a relational problem, between a perceptual style and a symbolic environment, as an intrinsic flaw located inside a person.

None of this requires denying that neurodivergent individuals can experience profound suffering or that some perceptual patterns can become destabilizing, but it does require us to be precise about where that destabilization originates. A perceptual style that struggles in one context may thrive in another. Distress emerges not simply from how perception works, but from how little room there is for it to work differently. When an environment is rigid, its symbols overbearing, and ambiguity intolerable, variation becomes vulnerability.

Seen this way, neurodivergence does not sit at the margins of the discussion about hallucination; it reframes it entirely. What appears as hallucination is often a point at which the limits of neurotypical symbolic authority are revealed. The experience itself may be coherent, meaningful, even adaptive within a different frame, but that frame is unavailable or illegible within our dominant order. Rather than asking why the individual perceives incorrectly, a structural analysis asks why the system is so narrow that only one way of perceiving can count as correct.

This shift in perspective does not resolve the tension between perception and order. It deepens it. It forces us to confront the possibility that what we call pathology may sometimes be the cost of enforcing uniformity, and that the price of shared reality is paid disproportionately by those whose minds bind experience along different lines. The question, then, is not whether neurodivergent perception should be normalized or celebrated, but whether our symbolic environments can widen enough to accommodate the variation they already contain.

If neurodivergence reveals how perception can bind itself differently to the world over long spans of life, altered states reveal something complementary, that the symbolic grip we take

to be normal is neither inevitable nor permanent. There are moments, sometimes sought, sometimes stumbled into, when our usual machinery of categorization loosens its hold, and perception breathes in a wider rhythm. Psychedelics, meditation, trance, flow, and deep absorption differ enormously in method and context, yet they converge phenomenologically in a simple way. They do not typically flood the mind with new symbols. They thin the ones already there. The world does not become more conceptual; it becomes less so. What had been named recedes, and what had been backgrounded steps forward.

This distinction matters because it is often obscured by the language used to describe these states. We are inclined to think of altered perception as an excess, as seeing too much, feeling too intensely, or imagining what is not there, but in such states the opposite is closer to the truth. The alteration consists not in adding content, but in relaxing the filters that ordinarily constrain experience. Symbolic mediation softens. Our compulsive need to label, interpret, and resolve gives way, temporarily, to a more immediate contact with sensation, affect, and pattern. Our mind does not break; it unburdens itself.

The effects of this loosening are well documented, even if they resist tidy explanation. Perceptual bandwidth increases. Colors intensify not because pigment has changed, but because the mind has stopped averaging them down to utility. Sounds acquire texture. Temporal boundaries blur, not into chaos, but into continuity. The sense of being a discrete observer looking out at a world of objects can give way to a feeling of participation, of being woven into the same fabric as what is perceived. None of this requires positing hidden dimensions or supernatural insight. It follows naturally from reducing the rate at which experience is compressed into symbols.

With reduced categorical filtering comes an awareness of structures that are usually ignored. Patterns in nature, subtle shifts in mood, and the interplay between thought and sensation all become noticeable when they are no longer drowned out by the noise of constant interpretation. What is striking is how familiar this can feel. People often report that such states are not alien but oddly remembered, as though something long known has been set aside and then rediscovered. This sense of familiarity suggests that altered perception is not a departure from perception as such, but a change in how tightly perception is managed.

At this point, the overlap with neurodivergent phenomenology becomes apparent. Heightened sensitivity to detail, difficulty backgrounding certain stimuli, awareness of patterns others overlook, these features recur across both domains, yet the resemblance should not be mistaken for identity. The crucial difference lies in context and duration. Altered states are typically bounded. They occur within containers of rituals, practices, or cultural narratives that frame them as temporary departures. There is an expectation of return. Neurodivergent perception, by contrast, is not entered and exited at will. It is the baseline from which the world is encountered. What is a brief loosening for one person may be a lifelong condition for another.

This difference in context has profound implications for how such experiences are interpreted. When perceptual loosening is sanctioned through meditation, art, or carefully controlled psychedelic use it is often described as insight or exploration. When similar phenomena arise without an accepted container, they are more readily framed as symptoms. The experience itself may be comparable, but the story told about it is not. Meaning hinges not only on what is perceived, but on whether there is a shared understanding of why it is happening and how it fits into a larger pattern of life.

This brings us back to the question of pathology. If altered perception frequently involves symbolic loosening rather than symbolic excess, then many experiences labeled pathological may be better understood as unsupported perception. The problem is not that perception has failed, but that it has been exposed without adequate scaffolding. A mind that encounters heightened sensory or symbolic intensity in an environment that demands constant normalization is likely to suffer, not because the experience is inherently damaging, but because there is no place for it to land. The mismatch generates distress, confusion, and sometimes fear, which are then attributed to the experience itself rather than to the conditions under which it occurred.

Seen in this light, the line between breakdown and breakthrough appears less like a natural boundary and more like a function of support. Symbolic breakdown occurs when meaning collapses under pressure, when symbols harden or fragment in ways that make experience unlivable. Symbolic loosening, by contrast, can be generative when it is buffered by trust,

guidance, and cultural permission. The same reduction in filtering that yields wonder in one setting can yield terror in another. The difference is not in the perception, but in the surrounding ecology.

It is tempting, especially in a culture uneasy with ambiguity, to treat all departures from normative perception as steps down the same path toward disorder, but this temptation obscures an important fact. Perception is dynamic. It moves along continua of openness and closure, compression and release. Altered states make this dynamism visible. They remind us that what we call normal is not a fixed point, but a negotiated balance that can shift under different conditions. To mistake these shifts for malfunctions is to confuse flexibility with fragility.

None of this implies that altered perception is always benign, or that all such experiences should be encouraged. Context matters. Duration matters. Integration matters. But a structural understanding allows us to ask better questions. Instead of asking whether an experience is real or unreal, healthy or unhealthy, we can ask whether it is supported, whether it can be made sense of, and whether it can be woven back into a life without tearing it apart. When perception loosens and there is nowhere for it to go, suffering follows. When it loosens and is met with understanding, the result can be expansion rather than collapse.

By recognizing altered perception as a modulation of symbolic binding rather than a deviation from reality, we create conceptual space for nuance. Experiences no longer have to be sorted immediately into the bins of pathology or revelation. They can be approached as signals about how perception is functioning in relation to its constraints. This perspective does not romanticize altered states, but it does rescue them from the reflexive suspicion that treats any loosening of symbolic control as dangerous. In doing so, it quietly prepares the ground for a harder question, why systems built to care for minds have become so quick to equate perceptual flexibility with risk, and so slow to recognize the difference between unsupported experience and genuine dysfunction.

When altered perception is understood as a loosening of symbolic grip rather than a collapse of reality, the next question presses in almost automatically. Why does this loosening provoke such anxiety at the level of systems? The answer does not require hidden motives

or coordinated suppression. It follows directly from what symbolic systems are and what they are for. Symbols do not merely describe the world; they organize it. They stabilize authority by fixing meanings, enable coordination by standardizing expectations, and maintain legitimacy by presenting those arrangements as natural rather than contingent. A symbolic system succeeds when it renders the world predictable enough for large numbers of people to move through it together without constant renegotiation.

This success depends on symbols occupying a privileged position. They must stand between experience and action, filtering what counts as relevant, sayable, and actionable. When this mediation works smoothly, it disappears from view. The categories feel obvious. The rules feel given. Reality appears to announce itself directly, when in fact it is being quietly translated at every step. Authority rests on this invisibility. If symbols are mistaken for reality itself, then those who manage symbols appear to manage reality, and legitimacy flows accordingly.

Trouble begins when experience bypasses this mediation, not by rejecting symbols outright, but by loosening their hold. When perception becomes less tightly bound to established categories, meaning begins to decentralize. People find significance in places not pre-authorized by the system. Interpretations proliferate. What once had a single, agreed-upon sense becomes ambiguous again. From within the system, this does not look like curiosity or exploration; it looks like noise. Authority destabilizes because it no longer commands a monopoly on interpretation. Coordination falters because shared expectations fracture. The system experiences this not as a philosophical challenge, but as an operational threat.

Under these conditions, the response is strikingly consistent. Symbolic systems move to defend themselves not by argument, but by tightening form. Literalization replaces metaphor. Where meaning once floated, definitions are imposed. Where experience resisted naming, categories multiply. The ambiguous is rendered concrete, not because concreteness is truer, but because it is manageable. Alongside this comes risk framing. Experiences that do not conform are no longer merely different; they are potentially dangerous. Uncertainty is recast as hazard. What cannot be predicted must be controlled.

This pattern does not require anyone to decide that difference is bad. It emerges automatically from the demands of coordination at scale. A system responsible for managing populations cannot afford prolonged ambiguity. It must act, allocate resources, assign responsibility. In doing so, it privileges interpretations that reduce variance and penalizes those that expand it. The pathologization of certain experiences is one expression of this pressure. It is not a moral judgment so much as an administrative one. Experiences that cannot be easily integrated are treated as faults in the individual rather than as signals of strain in the system.

Within this landscape, psychiatry occupies a particularly sensitive position. It stands at the boundary between private experience and public legitimacy, translating one into terms the other can accept. Structurally, its role is not simply to alleviate suffering, though that is often the intention of those who practice it. Its role is also to determine which experiences can be recognized as meaningful and which must be reclassified as symptoms. In doing so, psychiatry helps maintain the symbolic order by deciding when perception counts as insight, when it counts as error, and when it must be neutralized for the sake of stability.

This boundary work becomes especially fraught for neurodivergent populations. Because our modes of perception already strain dominant symbolic norms, we are more likely to encounter this defensive apparatus. Experiences that sit awkwardly with established categories are more readily interpreted as signs of dysfunction. The question shifts subtly but decisively from “How does this person experience the world?” to “How far does this experience deviate from what we expect?” Deviation becomes the metric, and pathology its name.

What makes this dynamic difficult to see is that it often operates under the banner of care. Risk framing is justified by concern for safety. Categorization is defended as necessary for treatment. Literalization is presented as clarity. Each move has a rationale that appears compassionate when viewed in isolation. Together, they form a system that is remarkably intolerant of perceptual flexibility. Experiences that loosen symbolic grip are not merely misunderstood; they are preemptively contained.

It is important to note that this defensiveness does not imply that symbolic systems are malicious or that they could simply choose to behave otherwise. Symbols are tools for managing complexity, and when complexity exceeds a system's capacity to absorb it, contraction is the predictable response. The tragedy lies not in the existence of this response, but in the fact that it is rarely acknowledged as such. Pathologization is presented as discovery rather than as a stabilizing maneuver. The system forgets that it is choosing legibility over openness and mistakes that choice for necessity.

Once this is seen, our earlier themes begin to converge. Altered perception without support appears dangerous because it bypasses the usual channels of meaning-making. Neurodivergent perception appears unreliable because it does not conform to dominant compression strategies. Hallucination appears as a thing because naming it as such restores symbolic control. In each case, the move is the same. Uncertainty is relocated from the shared world into the individual mind. The cost of this relocation is borne unevenly, falling most heavily on those whose perceptual styles already test the limits of symbolic tolerance.

What emerges is not a picture of villainy, but of fragility. Symbolic systems defend themselves because they are stretched thin. They react defensively because they lack the capacity to hold too much variation without losing coherence. The more rigid they become, the more variation feels like threat, and the more threat is perceived, the more urgently difference must be named, sorted, and managed. The question this raises is not whether such systems are justified in protecting themselves, but what happens when protection becomes indistinguishable from constriction, and care from control.

When this defensive reflex is traced backward in time, it leads not to a single decision or doctrine, but to a period when symbolic stability was tested at an unprecedented scale. The psychedelic 1960s are often remembered as a cultural spectacle that was colorful, chaotic, naïve, or romantic, depending on the teller, but this framing obscures what was structurally distinctive about the moment. What occurred was not simply a rebellion of values or a fashion for altered states, but a sudden and widespread increase in symbolic permeability. Filters that had long operated quietly on perceptual, moral, social, and identity were loosened all at once, across large segments of the population.

For a brief period, experiences that had previously been marginal, private, or quietly tolerated surged into public visibility. Psychedelics played a role, but they were not the sole driver. Meditation, new forms of spirituality, challenges to traditional authority, and experiments in communal living all contributed to the same underlying shift. The symbolic frameworks that told people who they were, what mattered, and how the world was structured began to feel provisional rather than fixed. Identity, once inherited or assigned, appeared malleable. Meaning, once anchored in institutions, seemed available through direct experience. Perception itself felt negotiable.

What is easy to miss, especially in hindsight, is how ordinary many of these experiences were once the filters relaxed. States of heightened sensitivity, fluid identity, nonlinear thinking, and deep pattern recognition, long associated with mystics, artists, or the quietly divergent, were no longer confined to the margins. They became temporarily normalized. People who had always lived with looser symbolic bindings found themselves less alone. Those who had never questioned the solidity of their perceptual world suddenly glimpsed its contingency. For a moment, variation in perception was not immediately sorted into pathology or error; it was simply happening, everywhere.

This overlap with neurodivergent experience is crucial, though it was rarely named as such at the time. Modes of perception that struggled under rigid symbolic regimes found a cultural moment in which they could breathe. What had been isolating became shareable. What had been dismissed as odd acquired language, music, and ritual. The significance of this cannot be reduced to the substances involved. The deeper shift was a collective relaxation of the assumption that symbols perfectly mirrored reality. The map was no longer taken for the territory, and people noticed.

For institutions built on stable mediation, this was a profound shock. Symbolic systems depend on their own invisibility. They function best when the categories they enforce feel natural, inevitable, and beyond question. The events of the 1960s made this mediation visible. People did not merely disagree with authority; they questioned the basis on which authority claimed access to truth in the first place. When symbols became objects of scrutiny rather than unquestioned guides, their power weakened. Coordination faltered not

because people were irrational, but because the shared frame that coordinated them was under revision.

From inside institutional systems, this did not appear as philosophical inquiry or perceptual exploration. It appeared as destabilization. Too many meanings circulated at once. Too many identities were self-authored. Too many experiences bypassed established channels of validation. This was not madness in the clinical sense, but it threatened control in a structural one. Systems that relied on predictable roles and clear boundaries faced a population increasingly comfortable with ambiguity. The risk was not that people were seeing things that were not there, but that they were no longer seeing only what they were supposed to see.

The response that followed is often framed as moral backlash or political reaction, but at a deeper level it was a reassertion of symbolic authority. Filters tightened. Categories hardened. Experiences that had briefly been tolerated as exploration were reclassified as dangerous or deviant. The loosening of perception was reinterpreted as loss of discipline. What had been an opening was recast as a threat. In this reframing, altered states became suspect not because they were false, but because they undermined the system's ability to define what counted as true.

This is why the period cannot be understood simply as excess followed by correction. It was a test of how much perceptual and symbolic variation large-scale systems could tolerate. The answer, delivered gradually over the following decades, was, not much. The visibility of mediation had to be reversed. Symbols needed to recover their appearance of necessity. Experiences that did not pass through authorized frameworks had to be contained, managed, or dismissed. What had briefly been an experiment in collective looseness became a lesson in the dangers of letting symbols slip.

The 1960s mark a turning point not because they introduced something entirely new, but because they revealed something that had always been present. Human perception has always been more flexible, more variable, and more negotiable than our systems willingly admit. For a moment, that flexibility surfaced at scale, and the strain it placed on symbolic order was unmistakable. The decades that followed can be read as a long effort to ensure

that such visibility would not recur unchecked and restore the comforting illusion that reality, once named, stays put.

What followed this moment of symbolic exposure was not a single reversal but a gradual tightening, a long recalibration of how much ambiguity could be tolerated before it threatened coherence. Systems rarely announce such shifts in philosophical terms. They respond pragmatically, often defensively, translating diffuse unease into concrete policies and procedures. The backlash that took shape in the decades after the symbolic shock of the 1960s can be understood in this way. It was an effort to restore legibility where meaning had begun to drift, and to reassert control where interpretation had become too plural to manage.

One of the most visible expressions of this effort was the War on Drugs. Whatever moral language surrounded it, its structural function was clear. Experiences that altered perception outside sanctioned channels were reframed as risks to be eliminated rather than phenomena to be understood. The issue was not simply the substances themselves, but what they represented, direct access to altered states without institutional mediation. By criminalizing these experiences, the system did more than regulate behavior; it reasserted authority over which modes of perception were permissible. Ambiguity was converted into danger, and danger into justification for control.

At the same time, the internal architecture of mental health classification expanded rapidly. Diagnostic manuals grew thicker, more detailed, and more precise. This expansion is often narrated as progress, greater sensitivity, and finer distinctions, but it also served a stabilizing function. As experiences proliferated and identities diversified, categorization provided a way to recontain variation. To name something is to render it legible, and legibility is the precondition of governance. The multiplication of diagnoses did not necessarily reflect a sudden discovery of hidden disorders; it reflected a growing need to map experience tightly enough that it could be tracked, predicted, and managed.

Risk-based governance completed the picture. Increasingly, decisions about health, behavior, and intervention were justified not by present harm, but by projected outcomes. Possibility itself became a site of regulation. Experiences were evaluated not only for what

they were, but for what they might lead to. Under such a framework, ambiguity is intolerable, because it resists calculation. The safest course is to intervene early, to name and contain difference before it can unfold in unpredictable ways. In this climate, caution easily shades into suspicion, and suspicion into surveillance.

The structural logic connecting these developments is straightforward. Ambiguity disrupts coordination. Legibility restores it. Control follows. When meanings multiply faster than systems can absorb them, systems simplify. They draw sharper lines, enforce clearer categories, and narrow the range of acceptable deviation. This is not because ambiguity is inherently bad, but because large-scale systems cannot operate on it for long without losing their grip. The move from openness to literalization is not ideological so much as mechanical.

For neurodivergent individuals, the consequences of this tightening were immediate and enduring. As tolerance for variation decreased, behaviors and perceptions that once hovered at the edges of normality were pulled firmly into diagnostic space. Differences in attention, affect, or perception became signals to be interpreted, logged, and monitored. Diagnosis rates climbed not merely because more people were suffering, but because the threshold for what counted as deviation lowered. Surveillance followed naturally. Once variation is framed as risk, it must be watched.

Reduced tolerance is perhaps the most subtle effect, and the most corrosive. Environments that had once accommodated eccentricity or difference, however imperfectly, became less forgiving. The margin for idiosyncrasy narrowed. The expectation shifted from adaptation to compliance. Neurodivergent individuals found themselves increasingly required to justify their experiences in institutional language, translating lived complexity into forms that could be processed by systems designed for standard cases. Those who could not perform this translation effectively were more likely to be labeled severe, resistant, or noncompliant.

Within this landscape, psychiatry assumed a more explicitly regulatory role. Structurally, it became an enforcement layer for symbolic order under stress. This is not a condemnation of practitioners, many of whom act with genuine care and integrity. It is an observation about function. Psychiatry was tasked with drawing boundaries between acceptable and

unacceptable experience, between variation and disorder, between what could be supported and what had to be corrected. In doing so, it helped stabilize a system uneasy with ambiguity.

The authority of psychiatry rests on its ability to convert subjective experience into objective-seeming categories. This conversion is indispensable for coordination at scale, but it carries a cost. The more tightly experience is categorized, the less room there is for negotiation, context, and meaning. What does not fit cleanly is more likely to be forced into a category than to prompt a revision of the categories themselves. Over time, this produces a feedback loop. The system's need for clarity shapes its definitions, and those definitions then justify further tightening.

It is important to notice how impersonal this process is. No one needs to decide that neurodivergent perception is unwelcome. The structure itself ensures that deviation is experienced as friction, and friction as something to be minimized. Literalization and categorization do not arise from hostility toward difference, but from an inability to live with too much of it. The more complex and interconnected a system becomes, the more it depends on simplifications to function at all.

The tragedy is that these simplifications, while stabilizing in the short term, generate the very distress they are meant to manage. As symbolic environments grow more rigid, the cost of nonconformity rises. People adapt by masking, suppressing, or doubting their own perceptions, often at significant psychological expense. What appears as an epidemic of mental illness is the echo of this adaptation; a population straining to fit into forms that have become too narrow.

Backlash through literalization and categorization is neither an overreaction nor a correction, but a predictable phase in the life of symbolic systems under pressure. It restores order by reducing variance, but it does so by externalizing the cost of that reduction onto individuals whose ways of perceiving do not compress easily. The question it leaves unanswered is how long such a strategy can hold, and what happens when the effort to maintain control begins to undermine the very coherence it seeks to preserve.

By the time the mechanisms of control finished recalibrating themselves, the original shock that provoked them was no longer visible. What remained was a new normal, one shaped less by the exuberance of symbolic looseness than by the quiet accumulation of safeguards against it. The arc from the mid-twentieth century to the present can be read, in this sense, as a movement through three phases. An opening in which symbols briefly loosened their grip, a backlash in which authority reasserted itself through categorization and risk, and finally an over-tightening in which the very tools of stabilization began to strain under their own weight. What started as correction hardened into constraint.

In the present moment, this over-tightening expresses itself as hyper-categorization. Experiences are named quickly and often prematurely. Identities are parsed into finer and finer distinctions, each carrying expectations, narratives, and protocols. This proliferation of categories is often defended as inclusion, as making space for difference by giving it a name. The effect is frequently the opposite. The more tightly experience is labeled, the less room there is for ambiguity, drift, or transformation. To be named is to be fixed, and to be fixed is to be monitored. Categories that were once meant to clarify now function as containers that resist revision.

Alongside hyper-categorization comes identity rigidity. What began as recognition that identity could be negotiated has, in many contexts, congealed into the demand that it be declared, defended, and maintained. Identity becomes less a living process than a contractual obligation. One is expected to know who one is, to state it clearly, and to remain consistent over time. Deviations are treated with suspicion, not because change is inherently threatening, but because systems optimized for legibility depend on stability. Fluidity complicates management. The cost of this rigidity is borne by those whose sense of self does not settle easily into predefined forms.

Self-monitoring completes the triad. Individuals are increasingly tasked with observing themselves through the lens of institutional categories. Symptoms are tracked, moods logged, and behaviors assessed. This reflexive turn is often framed as empowerment or self-awareness, but it carries an implicit demand that one’s inner life be rendered intelligible in terms that systems can process. The self becomes a project of continuous audit. For some,

this offers a sense of control. For others, it produces a low-grade anxiety, a feeling of always being slightly out of compliance with an invisible checklist.

For neurodivergent individuals, these conditions amplify an already existing mismatch. Perceptual styles that do not compress easily into dominant symbolic forms are subjected to relentless translation pressure. The effort required to appear coherent, appropriate, and legible becomes a constant drain. Masking, compensating, and self-correcting are not occasional strategies; they become ways of life. The distress that results is often interpreted as evidence of internal disorder, when it is more accurately the signal of an environment that demands too much conformity from systems not designed to provide it.

This is why our contemporary mental health crisis cannot be adequately explained by reference to individual pathology alone. Rising rates of anxiety, depression, burnout, and despair are not simply an aggregate of broken minds. They reflect a deeper structural tension between the variability of human perception and the rigidity of the symbolic environments we have built. When systems overfit, when they optimize too narrowly for predictability and control, they lose resilience. Small deviations produce outsized strain. What once would have been absorbed as difference now registers as dysfunction.

Symbolic overfit operates much like any other form of overfitting. A model that has been trained too closely on a specific dataset performs well under familiar conditions but poorly when confronted with novelty. Our symbolic systems, honed to manage particular historical circumstances, now struggle to accommodate the diversity of perceptual styles they encounter. Rather than revising the model, we tend to blame the data. Individuals are told they are anxious, disordered, or maladapted, when the deeper issue is that the symbolic frame itself has become too brittle.

This brittleness is not evenly distributed. Those whose perceptions align closely with dominant norms can move through these environments with relative ease, often unaware of the strain they impose. Those of us whose perceptions diverge feel the friction constantly. The result is a pattern of disproportionate distress among neurodivergent populations, not because we are inherently more fragile, but because we are more exposed to the costs of symbolic rigidity. What appears as vulnerability is often endurance stretched too thin.

The language of crisis is therefore apt, but it is often misdirected. We speak as though the problem lies in an excess of sensitivity, an inability to cope, and a generation too fragile for the demands of reality. Evidence suggests something else. Our shared symbolic reality has narrowed to the point where ordinary variation becomes intolerable. The pressure to fit, to explain oneself, and to remain consistent, accumulates until it is experienced as personal failure. The system's limits are internalized as self-blame.

Our mental health crisis is not an anomaly but a predictable outcome of prolonged over-tightening. Stabilization, pushed too far, becomes suffocation. Control, refined without regard for variation, produces fragility rather than strength. The question that emerges is not how to repair so many broken individuals, but how to loosen a symbolic environment that has forgotten how much diversity it was once able to hold.

If the category of hallucination has been doing more obscuring than clarifying, then rethinking mental health requires a corresponding shift in how we frame experience itself. The most common alternatives on offer are not much help. On one side lies the language of error. The brain as a faulty machine producing false outputs that must be corrected, suppressed, or overridden. On the other lies a romantic counter-myth of unusual perception as hidden truth, mystical insight breaking through the illusion of ordinary reality. Both positions share a deeper assumption that experience must be justified by appealing to something beyond itself, either pathology or revelation. What they lack is a way of speaking about experience as situated, relational, and historically shaped.

A more grounded model begins by abandoning the search for intrinsic explanations. Experiences do not arise in isolation, nor do they announce their meaning independently of context. They emerge from long-term coupling between organism and environment, between perceptual capacities and the conditions in which those capacities are exercised. Over time, bodies and minds adapt to the rhythms, demands, and affordances of the worlds they inhabit. What is perceived, how it is interpreted, and whether it becomes a source of distress are all shaped by this ongoing relationship. To treat experience as a self-contained event inside the head is to ignore the field from which it arises.

From this perspective, the question of mental health shifts subtly but decisively. Instead of asking whether a perception is true or false, normal or abnormal, we can ask whether it is supported, sustainable, and integrated. Does the environment provide ways for this experience to make sense, be communicated, and be lived with? Or does it demand constant suppression, translation, and self-doubt? The difference matters. An experience that becomes overwhelming in one context may be manageable, even generative, in another. Distress often signals not a failure of perception, but a failure of fit.

This reframing has immediate implications for how we think about care. If suffering arises from chronic mismatch rather than intrinsic defect, then the task is not simply to dampen perception or correct cognition. It is to examine the symbolic and material conditions under which perception unfolds. Environments saturated with rigid expectations, relentless categorization, and narrow definitions of normality place extraordinary demands on perceptual systems that do not compress easily. The resulting strain is then misread as evidence of disorder. A structural approach asks instead how those demands might be altered.

Such a shift does not require utopian redesign or the abandonment of all categories. It requires a change in emphasis. Instead of asking individuals to contort themselves into existing symbolic forms, we can ask how those forms might be loosened, diversified, or made more permeable. Small changes in context, how work is organized, how social interaction is structured, or how ambiguity is tolerated, can have disproportionate effects on well-being. These changes do not cure experience; they make it livable.

Within this framework, neurodivergence no longer appears as a problem to be fixed or a gift to be celebrated in abstraction. It appears as a variation to be contextualized. Different perceptual styles place different demands on environments, just as different environments privilege certain styles over others. Accommodation, in this sense, is not indulgence but realism. It acknowledges that no single symbolic arrangement can suit all ways of perceiving, and that insisting otherwise generates unnecessary suffering.

Crucially, this approach also dissolves the need to reify hallucinations. When experience is understood as relational, the impulse to locate error entirely within the individual weakens.

An experience that cannot be easily shared or validated may still be coherent within the person's perceptual world. The task becomes one of translation rather than eradication. What is this experience responding to? What constraints shape it? How might it be situated so that it no longer appears as an inexplicable intrusion, but as part of a broader pattern of sense-making?

This does not mean that all experiences can or should be accommodated without limit. Some patterns of perception do become destabilizing, and some forms of distress require intervention, but intervention need not begin with denial of the experience's legitimacy. It can begin with curiosity about its conditions. Suppression treats perception as the problem. Contextualization treats perception as information. The difference is subtle, but it changes the entire orientation of care.

What emerges, then, is not a new doctrine but a shift in posture. A willingness to sit with uncertainty a little longer. A refusal to collapse difference too quickly into diagnosis. A recognition that symbolic systems are tools, not mirrors, and that their limits will always be encountered first by those whose perceptions stretch them. Mental health is less about enforcing normality than about negotiating livability.

By stepping back from the impulse to declare what experiences really are, we recover the possibility of responding to them with nuance. We no longer have to choose between dismissal and mystification. We can acknowledge suffering without insisting on defect, and difference without demanding transcendence. In doing so, we loosen the grip of categories that have grown too heavy and make room for a conception of mental life that is flexible enough to reflect the diversity it already contains.

What remains, after tracing this long arc, is a quiet reversal of perspective. The category of hallucination, once treated as a solid object of concern, now appears fragile, less a discovery than a convenience. It has served as a kind of placeholder, a way of naming moments when experience refuses to align neatly with the symbolic order that governs shared reality. In doing so, it has hidden a set of deeper dynamics of how perception is shaped, how variation is managed, and how systems respond when their preferred maps no

longer capture the terrain. The word has endured not because it explains so much, but because it allows us to stop explaining where explanation becomes uncomfortable.

Seen in this light, many of the phenomena we gather under the banner of mental illness take on a different contour. What we have been calling symptoms often look less like malfunctions of individual minds and more like signals of mismatch between perceptual styles and environments, and between symbolic demands and human variability. Distress arises not simply because perception goes awry, but because there is nowhere for certain ways of perceiving to rest. The suffering is real, but its source is frequently mislocated. We look inward for defects when the strain is distributed across relationships, institutions, and expectations.

This mislocation has consequences. When mismatch is framed as malfunction, response narrows. The work becomes one of correction rather than negotiation, suppression rather than support. Individuals are asked to adapt endlessly to environments that remain unquestioned, while the possibility that those environments might be poorly tuned is rarely entertained. Over time, this produces a culture adept at diagnosing difference but clumsy at accommodating it. The cost of coherence is externalized; borne by those whose perceptions stretch the limits of what the system can comfortably hold.

The deeper question that emerges is not whether our categories are accurate, but whether they are adequate. Symbolic systems are indispensable; without them, shared life would dissolve into incoherence, but they are also provisional, shaped by historical contingencies and practical constraints. When they harden into absolutes, when they mistake their own boundaries for the edges of reality, they begin to fail the very purpose they were meant to serve. Coherence maintained at the expense of variation becomes brittle, and brittleness eventually breaks.

This brings us to the question that cannot be resolved here. Can societies tolerate perceptual diversity without losing coherence? Can shared reality remain shared while admitting that it is not exhausted by any single way of seeing? These are not questions with technical answers. They point instead to a tension that must be lived with rather than solved. Too much looseness, and coordination falters. Too much rigidity, and life constricts. The challenge lies

in learning where to flex and where to hold, and in recognizing that those boundaries may need to shift over time.

What becomes clear, at the end of this inquiry, is that our modern mental health crisis is not well described as an epidemic of excess perception. People are not seeing too much of the world; they are being asked to see it in too few ways. The range of acceptable experience has narrowed, even as the complexity of life has expanded. The result is a growing population of individuals whose perceptions do not fail them, but whose worlds fail to meet them halfway.

If there is a lesson here, it is not that categories like hallucination should be abolished, nor that all experiences should be treated as equally valid. It is that our confidence in these categories should be tempered by humility about what they conceal. When we encounter experiences that strain our frameworks, the question need not be how quickly we can name and contain them. It might instead be what they reveal about the limits of our current arrangements. In that pause, in the willingness to sit with difference a little longer, there is the possibility of a form of health that does not depend on uniformity, but on a more generous understanding of what it means to share a world.

References

James, B. (2025). Normal in a Neurotypical World, or Mental Health in the Grip of the Symbolic Attractor. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMNIA

James, B. (2025). Reality's Experiment: Neurotypical Lock-in, Neurodivergent Disruption. Kindle Direct. Audible. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMREN